

May 01, 2007

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2005/2006**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 1 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>ALAMEDA COUNTY</b>												
ALAMEDA CITY CIC						72		72	11	4	11	4
ALAMEDA COUNTY RDA												
EMERYVILLE RDA						21		21	3	1	3	1
FREMONT RDA												
HAYWARD RDA						57		57	9	3	9	3
LIVERMORE RDA	55		55	17	8	28		28	4	2	21	10
OAKLAND RDA						127	1	128	19	8	19	8
UNION CITY RDA	179		179	54	27						54	27
County Totals:	<b>234</b>		<b>234</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>BUTTE COUNTY</b>												
OROVILLE RDA						3	1	4	1	0	1	0
County Totals:						<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</b>												
BRENTWOOD RDA						63		63	9	4	9	4
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY RDA												
EL CERRITO RDA												
PITTSBURG RDA						176		176	26	11	26	11
RICHMOND RDA												
SAN RAMON RDA						350		350	53	21	53	21
County Totals:						<b>589</b>		<b>589</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Fresno COUNTY</b>												
CLOVIS CDA	76		76	23	11						23	11
FRESNO CITY RDA												

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

May 01, 2007

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2005/2006**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 2 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
ORANGE COVE RDA	322		322	97	48						97	48
PARLIER RDA												
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>398</b>		<b>398</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>60</b>						<b>119</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>HUMBOLDT COUNTY</b>												
ARCATA CDA												
EUREKA RDA	6		6	2	1	4		4	1	0	2	1
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>6</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>KERN COUNTY</b>												
BAKERSFIELD RDA	16		16	5	2						5	2
CALIFORNIA CITY RDA												
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>16</b>		<b>16</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>						<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>KINGS COUNTY</b>												
LEMOORE RDA		1	1	0	0						0	0
<b>County Totals:</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>LOS ANGELES COUNTY</b>												
BALDWIN PARK RDA												
BURBANK RDA						158		158	24	9	24	9
CLAREMONT RDA						6		6	1	0	1	0
LANCASTER RDA						147		147	22	9	22	9
LAWNDALE RDA												
LONG BEACH RDA												
LOS ANGELES CITY CRA	102	28	130	39	20	49		49	7	3	46	22
MONROVIA RDA	1		1	0	0						0	0
MONTEREY PARK RDA												

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

May 01, 2007

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2005/2006**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 3 of 9**

		<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
		<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>	
		<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
		1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>PICO RIVERA RDA</b>								9	9	1	1	1	1
<b>POMONA RDA</b>		82		82	25	12						25	12
<b>SAN FERNANDO RDA</b>							99		99	15	6	15	6
<b>SANTA MONICA RDA</b>													
<b>SOUTH EL MONTE RDA</b>		15		15	5	2	15		15	2	1	7	3
<b>WEST HOLLYWOOD RDA</b>													
<b>County Totals:</b>		<b>200</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>MADERA COUNTY</b>													
<b>MADERA RDA</b>		68	4	72	22	11						22	11
<b>County Totals:</b>		<b>68</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>11</b>						<b>22</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>MARIN COUNTY</b>													
<b>NOVATO RDA</b>							349		349	52	21	52	21
<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>349</b>		<b>349</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>MENDOCINO COUNTY</b>													
<b>FORT BRAGG RDA</b>			38	38	11	6						11	6
<b>County Totals:</b>			<b>38</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>						<b>11</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>MERCED COUNTY</b>													
<b>MERCED CITY RDA</b>		1		1	0	0						0	0
<b>County Totals:</b>		<b>1</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>MONTEREY COUNTY</b>													
<b>MONTEREY COUNTY CDA</b>							5		5	1	0	1	0
<b>SALINAS RDA</b>							46		46	7	3	7	3
<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>51</b>		<b>51</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ORANGE COUNTY</b>													
<b>ANAHEIM RDA</b>		101		101	30	15						30	15

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

May 01, 2007

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2005/2006**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 4 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b> [H&SC Section 33413(b)(1)]					<b>PART II</b> [H&SC Section 33413(b)(2)]					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
BREA RDA	2		2	1	0						1	0
BUENA PARK RDA						8		8	1	0	1	0
GARDEN GROVE CDA												
HUNTINGTON BEACH RDA												
LA PALMA CDC												
SANTA ANA CRA												
STANTON RDA												
TUSTIN COMMUNITY RDA						40		40	6	2	6	2
WESTMINSTER RDA						3		3	0	0	0	0
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>103</b>		<b>103</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>51</b>		<b>51</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>PLACER COUNTY</b>												
PLACER COUNTY RDA												
ROCKLIN RDA												
ROSEVILLE RDA							27	27	4	2	4	2
<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY</b>												
CATHEDRAL CITY RDA						3	8	11	2	1	2	1
COACHELLA RDA						28		28	4	2	4	2
DESERT HOT SPRINGS RDA						20		20	3	1	3	1
INDIAN WELLS RDA	128		128	38	19						38	19
LA QUINTA RDA						15	8	23	3	1	3	1
PALM DESERT RDA												
PALM SPRINGS RDA						1		1	0	0	0	0

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

May 01, 2007

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2005/2006**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 5 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>RIVERSIDE COUNTY RDA</b>	3		3	1	0						1	0
<b>RIVERSIDE RDA</b>	2		2	1	0						1	0
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>133</b>		<b>133</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>SACRAMENTO COUNTY</b>												
<b>SACRAMENTO CITY RDA</b>						49	4	53	8	3	8	3
<b>SACRAMENTO COUNTY RDA</b>												
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>49</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SAN BENITO COUNTY</b>												
<b>HOLLISTER RDA</b>							6	6	1	0	1	0
<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY</b>												
<b>COLTON RDA</b>		2	2	1	0						1	0
<b>FONTANA RDA</b>												
<b>GRAND TERRACE RDA</b>												
<b>HIGHLAND RDA</b>												
<b>MONTCLAIR RDA</b>												
<b>RANCHO CUCAMONGA RDA</b>												
<b>RIALTO RDA</b>												
<b>VICTORVILLE RDA</b>						273		273	41	16	41	16
<b>County Totals:</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>273</b>		<b>273</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>SAN DIEGO COUNTY</b>												
<b>CARLSBAD RDA</b>						3		3	0	0	0	0
<b>CHULA VISTA RDA</b>						106		106	16	6	16	6
<b>EL CAJON RDA</b>												

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

May 01, 2007

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2005/2006**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 6 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>POWAY RDA</b>												
<b>SAN DIEGO CITY RDA</b>						94	23	117	18	7	18	7
<b>SANTEE RDA</b>						90		90	14	5	14	5
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>293</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY</b>												
<b>S.F. CITY &amp; COUNTY RDA</b>	106		106	32	16	328		328	49	20	81	36
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>106</b>		<b>106</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>328</b>		<b>328</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY</b>												
<b>STOCKTON RDA</b>						40	38	78	12	5	12	5
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>40</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY</b>												
<b>ATASCADERO RDA</b>												
<b>EL PASO ROBLES RDA</b>												
<b>GROVER CITY RDA</b>												
<b>County Totals:</b>												
<b>SAN MATEO COUNTY</b>												
<b>BELMONT RDA</b>												
<b>MENLO PARK CDA</b>												
<b>SAN BRUNO RDA</b>						60		60	9	4	9	4
<b>SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO RDA</b>												
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>60</b>		<b>60</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SANTA BARBARA COUNTY</b>												
<b>LOMPOC RDA</b>						5	35	40	6	2	6	2
<b>SANTA BARBARA RDA</b>												
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>5</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

May 01, 2007

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2005/2006**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 7 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
<b>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</b>												
<b>CAMPBELL RDA</b>												
<b>MILPITAS RDA</b>						58		58	9	3	9	3
<b>MORGAN HILL RDA</b>	10		10	3	2	10		10	2	1	5	2
<b>SAN JOSE RDA</b>						142		142	21	9	21	9
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>210</b>		<b>210</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>SANTA CRUZ COUNTY</b>												
<b>CAPITOLA RDA</b>						2		2	0	0	0	0
<b>SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RDA</b>						4		4	1	0	1	0
<b>SCOTTS VALLEY RDA</b>						2		2	0	0	0	0
<b>WATSONVILLE RDA</b>	40		40	12	6						12	6
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>40</b>		<b>40</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>SHASTA COUNTY</b>												
<b>ANDERSON</b>						20	38	58	9	3	9	3
<b>REDDING RDA</b>	19	1	20	6	3	7	1	8	1	0	7	3
<b>SHASTA LAKE</b>												
<b>County Totals:</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>SOLANO COUNTY</b>												
<b>DIXON RDA</b>						25		25	4	2	4	2
<b>FAIRFIELD RDA</b>						53		53	8	3	8	3
<b>SUISUN CITY RDA</b>												
<b>VACAVILLE RDA</b>						4		4	1	0	1	0
<b>County Totals:</b>						<b>82</b>		<b>82</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Sonoma COUNTY</b>												

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.

May 01, 2007

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2005/2006**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 8 of 9**

	<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
	<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)]</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
	1. New Units	2. Sub. Rehab	3. Sum #1+#2	4. Incl Ob #3 x 30%	5. Very-Low #4 x 50%	6. New Units	7. Sub. Rehab.	8. Sum #6+#7	9. Incl. Ob. #8 x 15%	10. VLow #9x 40%	11. Sum #4+#9*	12. VLow #5+#10
CLOVERDALE RDA						1		1	0	0	0	0
COTATI RDA						16		16	2	1	2	1
HEALDSBURG RDA						5		5	1	0	1	0
PETALUMA CDC						117		117	18	7	18	7
ROHNERT PARK RDA						162		162	24	10	24	10
SANTA ROSA												
SONOMA CDA						4		4	1	0	1	0
SONOMA COUNTY CDC						4		4	1	0	1	0
County Totals:						<b>309</b>		<b>309</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>19</b>
STANISLAUS COUNTY												
CERES RDA						60		60	9	4	9	4
STANISLAUS COUNTY RDA							15	15	2	1	2	1
County Totals:						<b>60</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>
TULARE COUNTY												
PORTERVILLE RDA						31		31	5	2	5	2
TULARE COUNTY RDA												
TULARE RDA	5		5	2	1						2	1
VISALIA CRA												
WOODLAKE RDA												
County Totals:	<b>5</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>31</b>		<b>31</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>
VENTURA COUNTY												
OXNARD RDA						52		52	8	3	8	3
SAN BUENAVENTURA RDA						3		3	0	0	0	0
SANTA PAULA RDA						40		40	6	2	6	2

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.



May 01, 2007

**California Redevelopment Agencies**  
**INCREASE IN INCLUSIONARY OBLIGATION FROM APPLICABLE UNITS**  
**PRODUCED IN PROJECT AREAS DURING THE REPORTING YEAR 2005/2006**

**Exhibit G**  
**Page 9 of 9**

		<b>PART I</b>					<b>PART II</b>					<b>PART III</b>	
		<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(1)</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)</b>					<b>[H&amp;SC Section 33413(b)(2)]</b>	
		<b>-----AGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----NONAGENCY DEVELOPED-----</b>					<b>-----TOTALS-----</b>	
		1. New	2. Sub.	3. Sum	4. Incl Ob	5. Very-Low	6. New	7. Sub.	8. Sum	9. Incl Ob	10. VLow	11. Sum	12. VLow
		Units	Rehab	#1+#2	#3 x 30%	#4 x 50%	Units	Rehab.	#6+#7	#8 x 15%	#9x 40%	#4+#9*	#5+#10
<b>SIMI VALLEY CDA</b>													
<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>95</b>		<b>95</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>YOLO COUNTY</b>													
<b>DAVIS RDA</b>							18		18	3	1	3	1
<b>WEST SACRAMENTO RDA</b>							51		51	8	3	8	3
<b>County Totals:</b>							<b>69</b>		<b>69</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Total Agencies Contributing to this Report: 131</b>		<b>1,339</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>1,413</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>3,832</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>4,046</b>	<b>607</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>1,031</b>	<b>455</b>

**NOTES**

- \* Data is a summary of totals of all project areas' new construction and substantial rehabilitation (Post 1993) units from forms HCD-D2 through HCD-D7 (Appendix B) developed by any entity (agency or non-agency).
- \* Totals may be impacted by rounding.
- \* Requirements for Part I and II differ. Part I Agency Developed: Inclusionary is 30% with Very-Low of 50% of total. Part II Nonagency Developed: Inclusionary is 15% with Very-Low of 40% of total.
- \* Part III #12 is a subset of #11.